

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1-17, 21-27, and 29 are pending. Claims 18-20 and 28 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 30-32 are newly added.

Claims 1-16 and 18-29 stand rejected. Claim 17 stands unexamined.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8 and 18 were rejected for failing to provide antecedent basis for "the cache". Claim 8 has been amended to recite "the local cache" in place of "the cache". In amended Claim 8, the term "local cache" is used prior to "the local cache" and accordingly antecedent basis is provided for "the local cache". Claim 18 has been cancelled and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 12, 16, 21, 22, 25, 27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,683,885) (hereafter "Sugai") in view of Spencer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,295) (hereafter "Spencer"). The Examiner rejected Claims 3-5, 7-9, 10, 13-15, 18-20, 23, 24, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugai in view of Spencer and further in view of Richman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,152) (hereafter "Richman").

Telephone Conference on August 9, 2005

On August 9, 2005, Primary Examiner Dinh agreed to withdraw finality of the office action dated May 5, 2005. The Examiner further indicated that all pending Claims are allowable over the teachings and suggestions of the Sugai, Richman, and Spencer

references. The Examiner stated that he reserves the right to conduct a search for prior art and to reject any claim in view of any reference found during the search in combination with Richman and/or Spencer.

Claim Amendments and New Claims

No new matter is added.

Amendment to Claim 8 to recite “a processor and a host memory, wherein the host memory is to store protocol headers and application data into packet buffers” (emphasis added) was made to more clearly set out the claim scope and not to overcome the cited references. Support for the amendment to Claim 8 is found for example in Figure 1 and accompanying text. Amendments to Claims 9 and 26 were made to correct typographical errors.

New Claims 30-32 include similar elements as recited in allowable Claim 1 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as pertain to Claim 1. Support for new Claims 30-32 can be found for example in the originally filed claims and in Figure 1 and accompanying text.

Final Remarks

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow pending Claims 1-17, 21-27, and 29 as well as newly added Claims 30-32.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, please call the applicant’s attorney, Glen Choi, at (212) 661-5488.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFAM LLP

Dated: 19 Aug. 2005

Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300

Application No. 09/733,246

11

Docket No. 42P10203